

REMARKS

Claims 1-4 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Karube et al. (U.S. 6,072,456). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection because the cited reference does not disclose (or suggest) a liquid crystal display (“LCD”) device having a driving part that uses a plurality of driving devices together for each data signal line simultaneously to drive the data signal lines, as in claim 1 of the present invention, as amended.

Claim 1 of the present invention, as originally filed, contained an inadvertent typographical error, namely, the omission of the term “simultaneously” at the end of the claim. Applicants have amended claim 1 to correct for this typographical error, and respectfully traverse the rejection in light of this amendment. Applicants submit that the Karube reference fails to teach or suggest that its data signal lines are driven simultaneously by using a plurality of driving devices together.

In fact, Karube teaches the opposite. Karube specifically teaches that the shift registers 101 through 104 perform in parallel the operations of sequentially generating enable signals from the several output terminals. (See col. 5, lines 34-37; Fig. 3). Sequential operation in parallel is significantly different from simultaneous operation. Accordingly, for at least these reasons, the Section 102 rejection of claim 1, and therefore also its dependent claims 2-4, based on Karube is respectfully traversed.

Claims 1-6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Murade et al. (U.S. 6,377,235). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection similarly to

those reasons discussed above in traversing the rejection based on Karube. The cited reference fails to teach (or suggest) an LCD device that supplies a plurality of sets of the same image display data to each data signal line simultaneously.

Contrary to the Examiner's assertion on page 3 of Paper No. 5, Murade does not teach simultaneous operation or supply, but instead specifically teaches that the image signals VID1 through VID6 are sequentially supplied. (See col. 16, lines 49-51). Just as with Karube, discussed above, Murade teaches a significantly different timing and operation of the image signals and the signal lines than featured in the present invention. Accordingly, for at least these reasons, the Section 102 rejection of claims 1-6 based on Murade is also respectfully traversed.

Claims 1-6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Zhang et al. (U.S. 6,611,261). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection also for reasons similar to those discussed above. The cited reference fails to teach (or suggest) the simultaneous features of the present invention.

Zhang specifically teaches that the control signals BL1- BL8 are successively supplied. (See col. 11, lines 28-29). Zhang further teaches that, in order to transfer one scan lines worth of video signals Vs, the latch signal is supplied as many as 8 times during one horizontal scan. (See col. 11, lines 54-60). Similar to the discussion above therefore, Zhang's successive application is significantly different than the simultaneous features of the present invention. Accordingly, the Section 102 rejection of claims 1-6 based on Zhang is also respectfully traversed.

Claims 7-12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Yamazaki et al. (U.S. 6,392,928). Claim 7 has been amended, and Applicants respectfully traverse in light of this amendment. The cited reference fails to disclose (or suggest) to convert the level of the control signal so as to create a signal level applicable to a circuit that achieves control of the display part in a dividing manner, as in claim 7 of the present invention, as amended.

Yamazaki merely discloses a peripheral circuit of a semiconductor display device that provides an increase in a voltage of a clock signal with a level shift circuit. Yamazaki's shift register that operates according to this clock signal is thus increased in operation speed. (See col. 2, lines 4-15). This portion of text cited from Yamazaki though, is not relevant to the present invention.

Claim 7 of the present invention (as well as its dependent claims 8-12) relates to control of the display part of an LCD in a dividing manner by use of a peripheral circuit. The display on the display part is therefore controlled in such a manner that the control signal level is converted to be applicable to a circuit in the peripheral circuit that renders control of the display part in a dividing manner possible. Applicants submit that Yamazaki fails to teach or suggest any such advantageous features. For at least these reasons, the Section 102 rejection of claims 7-12 based on Yamazaki is respectfully traversed.

For all of the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that this Application, including claims 1-12, is in condition for allowance, which is respectfully requested. The

Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney if an interview would expedite prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,

GREER, BURNS & CRAIN, LTD.

By



Josh C. Snider
Registration No. 47,954

Customer No. 24978

February 5, 2004

300 South Wacker Drive - Suite 2500

Chicago, Illinois 60606

Telephone: (312) 360-0080

Facsimile: (312) 360-9315

P:\DOCS\0941\66061\427632.DOC